

In the United States Court of Federal Claims

OFFICE OF SPECIAL MASTERS

No. 19-0955V

UNPUBLISHED

PHILIP MEYER,

Petitioner,

v.

SECRETARY OF HEALTH AND
HUMAN SERVICES,

Respondent.

Chief Special Master Corcoran

Filed: March 28, 2022

Special Processing Unit (SPU);
Decision Awarding Damages; Pain
and Suffering; Influenza (Flu);
Shoulder Injury Related to Vaccine
Administration (SIRVA).

Paul R. Brazil, Muller Brazil, LLP, Dresher, PA, for Petitioner.

Andrew Henning, U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, DC, for Respondent.

DECISION AWARDING DAMAGES¹

On July 1, 2019, Philip Meyer filed a petition for compensation under the National Vaccine Injury Compensation Program, 42 U.S.C. §300aa-10, *et seq.*² (the “Vaccine Act”). Petitioner alleged that he suffered a shoulder injury related to vaccine administration (“SIRVA”) as a result of an influenza (“flu”) vaccine administered on December 1, 2016. Petition at 1. The case was assigned to the Special Processing Unit of the Office of Special Masters. Because the parties could not informally resolve the appropriate award for pain and suffering, they were ordered to file briefs setting forth their

¹ Because this unpublished Decision contains a reasoned explanation for the action in this case, I am required to post it on the United States Court of Federal Claims' website in accordance with the E-Government Act of 2002. 44 U.S.C. § 3501 note (2012) (Federal Management and Promotion of Electronic Government Services). **This means the Decision will be available to anyone with access to the internet.** In accordance with Vaccine Rule 18(b), Petitioner has 14 days to identify and move to redact medical or other information, the disclosure of which would constitute an unwarranted invasion of privacy. If, upon review, I agree that the identified material fits within this definition, I will redact such material from public access.

² National Childhood Vaccine Injury Act of 1986, Pub. L. No. 99-660, 100 Stat. 3755. Hereinafter, for ease of citation, all section references to the Vaccine Act will be to the pertinent subparagraph of 42 U.S.C. § 300aa (2012).

respective arguments and were notified that I would resolve this dispute via an expedited “Motions Day” hearing, which ultimately took place on March 25, 2022.

Petitioner requested \$175,000.00 in compensation for Petitioner’s actual pain and suffering, while Respondent recommended an award of \$135,000.00. After listening to the arguments of both sides, I issued an oral ruling on damages constituting my findings of fact and conclusions of law, pursuant to Section 12(d)(3)(A), at the conclusion of the March 25, 2022, hearing. An official recording of the proceeding was taken by a court reporter, although a transcript has not yet been filed in this matter. I hereby fully adopt and incorporate that oral ruling as officially recorded.

As mentioned during my oral ruling, in another recent decision I discussed at length the legal standard to be considered in determining damages and prior SIRVA compensation within SPU. I fully adopt and hereby incorporate my prior discussion in Sections II and III of *Winkle v. Sec’y Health & Hum. Servs.*, No. 20-0485V, 2022 WL 221643, at *2-4 (Fed. Cl. Spec. Mstr. Jan. 11, 2022) to the instant Decision. Additionally, the official recording of my oral ruling includes my discussion of various comparable cases as well as specific facts relating to Petitioner’s medical history and experience that further informed my decision awarding damages herein.

Based on my consideration of the complete record as a whole plus the parties’ arguments, and for the reasons discussed in my oral ruling, pursuant to Section 12(d)(3)(A), **I find that \$145,000.00 represents a fair and appropriate amount of compensation for Petitioner’s actual pain and suffering.**³

Accordingly, **I award Petitioner a lump sum payment of \$152,947.12 (representing \$145,000.00 for pain and suffering, and \$7,947.12 for actual unreimbursed medical expenses⁴) in the form of a check payable to Petitioner.** This amount represents compensation for all damages that would be available under Section 15(a).

³ Since this amount is being awarded for actual, rather than projected, pain and suffering, no reduction to net present value is required. See Section 15(f)(4)(A); *Childers v. Sec’y of Health & Hum. Servs.*, No. 96-0194V, 1999 WL 159844, at *1 (Fed. Cl. Spec. Mstr. Mar. 5, 1999) (citing *Youngblood v. Sec’y of Health & Hum. Servs.*, 32 F.3d 552 (Fed. Cir. 1994)).

⁴ The parties stipulated to the amount for prior unreimbursed medical expenses. Petitioner’s Brief (ECF No. 41) at n. 1; Respondent’s Response (ECF No. 43) at n. 2.

The Clerk of Court is directed to enter judgment in accordance with this Decision.⁵

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/Brian H. Corcoran
Brian H. Corcoran
Chief Special Master

⁵ Pursuant to Vaccine Rule 11(a), entry of judgment can be expedited by the parties' joint filing of notice renouncing the right to seek review.